

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of this response. Claims 1-48 are currently pending. By way of this response, claims 1, 13, 15, 18 and 31 have been amended and claim 48 has been added. Claims 1 and 48 are independent claims.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration of all references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed October 9, 2003 as indicated by the Examiner's initials and signature on the Form PTO-1449.

PRIORITY DOCUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the acknowledgment of Applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 and the indication that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of the allowable subject matter set forth in claims 2-47.

DRAWING OBJECTIONS

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84 because FIGs. 1-9 allegedly do not include, "the following details reference label mentioned in the description." However, the Examiner has failed to point out any details and/or reference labels mentioned in the description and not shown in the drawings. Furthermore, after a thorough review of the specification and drawings, Applicant respectfully submits that all necessary reference numerals illustrated in each of FIGs. 1-9 are sufficiently described in the description and, as such, respectfully submits that the drawings are in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.84. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the above objections.

In the event the Examiner is still of the opinion that the above objection is valid, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out which details mentioned in the description the Examiner believes are not shown in FIGs. 1-9.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Debbins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,992, hereinafter referred to as "Debbins"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Debbins

Debbins is directed to a method and system for synchronizing acquisition of magnetic resonance images with the arrival of a signal enhancing contrast agent. More specifically, with regard to FIG. 1, during a scan operation excited nuclei within a patient cause radiation of signals, which are subsequently sensed by an RF coil 152 and amplified by preamplifier 153. The amplified signals are demodulated, filtered and digitized at a receiver section of the receiver 150 (see col. 5; ll. 26-33 of Debbins). The digitized signals are transferred to and stored in a memory module 160. After completion of the scan operation, an array of data stored in the memory module 160 is Fourier transformed into an array of image data. That is, an array of filtered data is Fourier transformed into an array of image data (see col. 5; ll. 41-47 of Debbins).

However, in contrast to the claimed invention (e.g., as set forth in claim 1), the cited portions of Debbins (i.e., col. 5; ll. 30-46) are directed to processing of a filtered magnetic resonance signal into a magnetic resonance image and, do not perform any post processing at all, let alone, post processing of raw magnetic resonance data.

In addition, Debbins also fails to teach or suggest at least, "forming a first magnetic resonance signal from the...filtered data results," and, "forming a second magnetic resonance signal from the...raw magnetic resonance data," as set forth in claim 1. Instead, at most, Debbins arguably discloses generating a magnetic resonance image data using only filtered magnetic resonance signals.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Debbins fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations set forth in claim 1 and, as such, respectfully requests withdrawal of the above rejection.

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

On pages 4 and 5 of the May 20, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner offers reasons why claims 2-47 of the present application are allowable over the prior art of record. Although Applicant agrees that these various claimed limitations mentioned in claims 2-47 are not taught or suggested by the prior art taken either singly or in combination, Applicant wishes to emphasize that it is the language of each claim, including the interrelationships and interconnections between various claimed elements which is allowable over the prior art of record, and not the Examiner's paraphrasing of claim features which may not be present in the allowed claims.

NEW CLAIMS

By way of this response, Applicant has added new independent claim 48, which Applicant also believes to be allowable over the prior art of record. Although somewhat similar arguments to those set forth above with regard to independent claim 1 may apply, Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claim 48 should be governed solely by the limitations presented therein and not by arguments set forth with regard to any other claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of above remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Andrew M. Waxman, Reg. No. 56,007, at the number of the undersigned listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By 
Donald J. Daley
Reg. No. 34,313

DJD/AMW:jcp

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000